



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,868	02/23/2004	Enrique Travieso	074869-0015	9488
20277	7590	02/12/2009	EXAMINER	
MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP			AL HASHIMI, SANA A	
600 13TH STREET, N.W.				
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2169	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/12/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/784,868	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TRAVIESO ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Sana Al-Hashemi	<b>Art Unit</b> 2169

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sana Al-Hashemi.

(3) Enrique Travieso.

(2) Stephen A. Baker.

(4) Qain Huang.

Date of Interview: 11 February 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 57, 72, and 88.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lakritz US Patent No. 6,523,426 in view of Kraft US Patent No. 2004/0128616.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant argued the Lakritz reference fails to disclose the motivation of the instant application as disclosed in Paragraphs 8, and 9. Examiner disagreed. And point out that the rejection based on a combination of more than one art and the argument should be directed to the combination of applied art and the argument should be directed to the claim language.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Sana Al-Hashemi/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2169	
--	--